

REMARKS

This application was originally filed on 13 November 2001 with nineteen claims, three of which were written in independent form. No claims have been allowed. Claims 1, 3, 10, and 19 have been amended, Claims 12-18 canceled, and Claims 20-23 added by this amendment. The amendments to Claims 1, 3, and 19 markedly broaden the scope of the claim. The amendment to Claim 10 incorporates the majority of the limitations of prior Claim 18 and broadens the scope of Claim 10 relative to prior Claim 18. Please charge any necessary fees, including any extension of time fees to the deposit account of Texas Instruments, Deposit Account No. 20-0668.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,532,765 to Inoue *et al.* ("Inoue"). The applicant respectfully disagrees.

Amended Claim 1 recites, "A method for convergence of an image projected by at least two modulators, the method comprising: turning on a test pixel in said projected image; capturing an image of said test pixel; separating said captured image into a separate image for each modulator; determining the x and y location of said test pixel; and calculating the convergence misalignment of the separated images." Inoue does not show, teach, or suggest this combination of recited limitations.

The Examiner stated, "turning on a grid pattern of pixels . . . is met by test signal pattern 209 (Fig 14) . . . capturing an image of said pixel . . . is met by imaging device 2 (Fig 1)/CCD camera 14 (Fig 5) . . . selecting a test pixel . . . is met where a specific sample (S20) Fig 18B is used as a reference point in calculating geometric distortion (col 13, lines 66 to col 14, line 4)."

The applicant respectfully submits does not show, teach, or suggest among other limitations, "determining the x and y location of said test pixel." Inoue's test signal pattern 209 referenced by the Examiner is a ramp signal that activates many pixels. Inoue states, "test signals 209 having rising/falling portions" (lines 29-30 of column 12). Thus, Inoue does not determine the x and y locations of a test pixel, but rather the distance between a reference point and the peak of the ramping test signal.

Claims 2 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue. Claims 4-7 were objected to for depending from a rejected base claim. The applicant respectfully disagrees. Claims 2-7 depend from Claim 1 and should be deemed allowable for

that reason and on their own merits. For the reasons argued above with respect to Claim 1, Inoue does not show, teach, or suggest the limitations of Claim 1, much less the limitations of Claim 1 in combination with the additional limitations of the dependent claims.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,456,339 to Surati *et al.* ("Surati"). The Examiner stated Claim 18 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 10 has been amended to include most of the limitations of canceled Claim 18 and should be deemed allowable for that reason.

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Surati. Claim 19 was objected to for depending from a rejected base claim. The applicant respectfully disagrees. Claims 11 and 19 depend from Claim 10 and should be deemed allowable for that reason and on their own merits. For the reasons argued above with respect to Claim 10, Surati does not show, teach, or suggest the limitations of Claim 10, much less the limitations of Claim 10 in combination with the additional limitations of the dependent claims.

Newly added Claims 20-23 should be deemed allowable for reasons similar to Claim 1 and for reciting additional limitations not found in Inoue or Surati.

In view of the amendments and the remarks presented herewith, it is believed that the claims currently in the application accord with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and are allowable over the prior art of record. Therefore, it is urged that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles A. Brill
Reg. No. 37,786

Texas Instruments Incorporated
PO Box 655474 M/S 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-4379
FAX: (972) 917-4418